

---

## APPENDIX G

### SUPPLEMENT FOR CHAPTER 5

This appendix provides supplementary information for the analyses reported in Chapter 5. Each Exhibit in the appendix corresponds to an Exhibit of the same number in Chapter 5. The boxes at the bottom of each Exhibit refer to District Eisenhower Coordinator Telephone Survey item numbers or composite variables on which the exhibit is based. District Coordinator Survey item numbers begin with the letter “D,” followed by the section of the survey (part A or B) and the item involved. For example, item numbers “DA044\_1, DA044\_2, and DA044\_3” refer to the District Coordinator Survey part A, item 44\_1, 2, and 3. (Item 44\_1 is shown on printed copies of the survey as 44a, 44\_2 is shown as 44b, etc.) All items referred to in the chapter appear in Exhibit 5.11d. Composite variables, which appear in all capital letters (for example, PDIRT), are defined in Exhibit 5.11b.

#### EXHIBIT G.5.1a

##### Percent of Teachers in Districts in which State and District Mathematics and Science Standards and Assessments Exist (n=363)

	State Standards	State Assessments	District Standards	District Assessments
Mathematics	90.8	91.3	84.9	69.5
Science	84.6	72.3	78.5	42.0

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** DA154, DA156, DA159, DA161, DA165, DA167, DA170, DA172

#### EXHIBIT G.5.1b

##### Percent of Teachers in Districts Where Eisenhower-assisted Activities Are Aligned “To a Large Extent” with State and/or District Standards and/or Assessments (Where Such Standards and Assessments Exist) (n varies)

	State Standards	State Assessments	District Standards	District Assessments
Mathematics	85.1	70.8	85.4	69.2
Science	83.4	70.4	85.7	66.8

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** DA155, DA157, DA160, DA162, DA166, DA168, DA171, DA173

# EXHIBIT G.5.1c

## Degree of Alignment Between Eisenhower-assisted Activities and Standards and Assessments, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size (n=363)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where <math>p \leq .05</math>)</i>			
Overall	4.0	.99	363							
Poverty Level				.10	2, 351	.90	Low	Medium	High	
Low	3.92	.99	124							
Medium	3.98	.96	131							
High	4.11	1.01	108							
District Size				4.26	3, 351	.01	Small	Medium	Large	Consortium
Small	3.74	1.10	98							
Medium	4.03	.91	130							
Large	4.25	.87	98				X			
Consortium	3.90	1.10	37							
Poverty*Size				.79	6, 351	.58				

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** pdirtx

## EXHIBIT G.5.2

### Percent of Teachers in Districts According to Eisenhower Coordinator's Roles within the District Office (n=363)

Position within district office	Percent of teachers in districts in which the district has the position	Percent of teachers in districts in which district Eisenhower Coordinator fills position	Percent of teachers in districts in which the person in the position participates in Eisenhower decision making
General Curriculum/Instruction Coordinator	80.2	48.0	90.5
Mathematics Coordinator	58.0	46.4	96.3
Science Coordinator	56.8	46.7	96.9
Professional Development Coordinator	69.1	38.9	80.6
Special Education Coordinator	91.5	8.4	61.9
Title I Coordinator	86.6	24.7	78.1
Federal Programs Coordinator	59.5	42.6	82.8

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** DA009-DA040

**Note:** There may be overlap in the positions filled by Eisenhower coordinators or positions filled by other individuals. For instance, an Eisenhower coordinator may be the district's curriculum coordinator and the district's mathematics and science coordinator. Similarly, any other individual who works closely with the Eisenhower coordinator may serve in multiple roles, for instance as the Title I coordinator and the federal programs coordinator.

### EXHIBIT G.5.3a

#### Percent of Teachers in Districts in which Eisenhower Activities Coordinate (Co-fund and/or Work Closely) with Other Programs (n varies)

Federal Program	Percent of teachers in districts where federal program operates in state/district	Percent of teachers in districts where federal program supports professional development in district	In districts where federal program operates and supports professional development, percent of teachers in districts that co-fund with other programs	Percent of teachers in districts with other federal programs in which Eisenhower coordinator works closely with other programs
SSI	44.4	66.7	65.7	59.2
USI	17.0	89.5	86.1	85.9
RSI	3.7	78.3	27.7	85.5
LSC	12.0	91.1	75.7	91.9
Title I, A	90.9	90.6	49.9	81.8
Title I, C	39.6	62.6	35.1	66.7
Title III	28.7	90.8	39.3	73.4
Title VI	77.0	72.8	47.7	77.9
Title VII	46.6	82.0	27.6	60.7
Title IX	19.1	56.9	4.9	42.3
IDEA	76.6	85.2	21.8	66.5
Goals 2000	85.8	73.5	33.9	61.0
School to Work	76.8	85.5	27.6	65.5
Perkins	73.8	83.5	18.7	62.2

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** DB005-DB060

**Note:** Results on co-funding for each listed program are based on districts that participate in the program and in which the program supports professional development. Results for working closely with each program are based on districts that participate in the program.

### EXHIBIT G.5.3b

#### Extent of Co-Funding of Eisenhower-assisted Activities with Those of Other Federal Programs, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size (n=363)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where <math>p \leq .05</math>)</i>			
Overall	2.06	(2.07)	363							
Poverty Level				15.42	2, 351	0.00	Low	Medium	High	
Low	1.19	(1.52)	124							
Medium	1.95	(1.94)	131							
High	3.00	(2.28)	108							
District Size				11.79	3, 351	0.00	Small	Medium	Large	Consortium
Small	1.10	(1.32)	98							
Medium	1.81	(1.75)	130							
Large	2.97	(2.35)	98							
Consortium	2.45	(2.55)	37							
Poverty*Size				2.20	6, 351	0.04				

*Source:* Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

*Variables:* NPROGF

### EXHIBIT G.5.3c

#### Extent of Co-funding of Eisenhower-assisted Activities with Those of Other Federal Programs, Interaction of District Poverty and District Size (n=363)

District Size	High Poverty		Medium Poverty		Low Poverty	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Small	1.70	(1.52)	1.43	(1.45)	.48	(.73)
Medium	2.41	(1.85)	1.87	(1.91)	1.40	(1.43)
Large	3.70	(2.36)	2.87	(2.26)	1.50	(1.68)
Consortium	4.06	(3.07)	1.50	(1.78)	2.40	(2.62)

*Source:* Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

---

#### EXHIBIT G.5.4

##### Percent of Teachers in Districts According to Status of District Performance Indicators for Professional Development (n=363)

Status of district performance indicators	Percent of teachers in districts
Developed indicators	32.00
Developing indicators	36.00
Not developing indicators	32.00

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.  
**Variables:** DB088 DB089

#### EXHIBIT G.5.5

##### Percent of Teachers in Districts that Use Different Methods to Assess Teachers' Professional Development Needs (n=363)

Needs assessment method	Percent
Teacher survey	79.70
Teacher meetings	69.90
Principal survey	70.60
Student performance	64.60
Informal conversation	75.70

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.  
**Variables:** DB079\_1, DB079\_2, DB079\_3, DB079\_4, DB079\_5

---

### EXHIBIT G.5.6

#### Percent of Teachers in Districts that Use Different Methods to Evaluate Eisenhower-assisted Activities (n=363)

Evaluation techniques	Percent
Teacher participation	69.90
Teacher survey	84.60
Observe teachers	71.40
Student achievement scores	60.00

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** DB084\_1—4

### EXHIBIT G.5.7

#### Percent of Teachers in Districts Whose Eisenhower Staff Provide Different Types of Guidance about Professional Development to Schools and Professional Development Providers (n=363)

Types of guidance	Percent of teachers in districts providing guidance to schools	Percent of teachers in districts providing guidance to providers
Classroom visits	64.06	53.08
Phone calls	78.86	74.72
Required reports	32.55	26.84
Required evaluations	40.64	44.11
Interpreting Title II rules	63.11	39.83
Conduct needs assessments	76.65	46.79
Develop plans	81.08	51.21
Develop activities	82.23	56.02
Develop indicators	39.66	25.64

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** DB143\_1 – DB143\_4, DB145\_1 – DB145\_5, DB147\_1-DB147\_4, DB149\_1-DB149\_5

## EXHIBIT G.5.8

### Extent of District Continuous Improvement Efforts, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size (n=363)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Tukey Pairwise Contrasts</i>			
<b>Overall</b>	2.64	(1.08)	363							
<b>Poverty Level</b>				4.17	2, 351	0.01	Low	Medium	High	
Low	2.46	(1.10)	136							
Medium	2.60	(1.02)	130							
High	2.86	(1.09)	97				X			
<b>District Size</b>				19.36	3, 351	0.00	Small	Medium	Large	Consortium
Small	1.97	(0.99)	98							
Medium	2.68	(0.97)	130				X			
Large	3.06	(0.97)	98				X	X		
Consortium	2.96	(1.17)	37				X			
<b>Poverty*Size</b>				2.06	6, 351	.06				

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** CONIMP\_D

**Scale Reliability:** .61

## EXHIBIT G.5.9a

### Percent of Teachers in Districts Reporting That None, Some, Most, or All Professional Development Activities Are Planned at the District, School, and Cluster Levels (n=363)

	Percentage of teachers in districts in which activities are planned at the indicated level none of the time	Percentage of teachers in districts in which activities are planned at the indicated level some of the time	Percentage of teachers in districts in which activities are planned at the indicated level most of the time	Percentage of teachers in districts in which activities are planned at the indicated level all of the time
District Level	6.6	43.1	34.0	16.2
School Level	19.2	48.1	22.7	9.7
Cluster Level	56.5	36.2	5.3	2.0

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** DA050, DA060, DA057



### EXHIBIT G.5.9b

#### Extent to Which Professional Development Activities Are Planned at the School vs. District Level, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size (n=363)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where <math>p \leq .05</math>)</i>			
Overall	2.32	(0.67)	363							
Poverty Level				1.49	2, 351	0.23	Low	Medium	High	
Low	2.25	(0.65)	136							
Medium	2.39	(0.68)	130							
High	2.28	(0.70)	97							
District Size				4.71	3, 351	0.00	Small	Medium	Large	Consortium
Small	2.44	(0.76)	98							x
Medium	2.32	(0.62)	130							x
Large	2.30	(0.67)	98							
Consortium	1.99	(0.56)	37							
Poverty*Size				0.62	6, 351	0.71				

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** DLEVPLAN

### EXHIBIT G.5.10

#### Percent of Teachers in Districts with Different Types of Teacher Involvement in School- and Cluster-level Professional Development Planning (n=363)

	Percent of teachers in districts with different types of teacher involvement in school-level professional development	Percent of teachers in districts with different types of teacher involvement in cluster-level professional development
Lead teachers/department chairs	76.8	40.2
Teacher committees	61.6	29.6
Individual teachers	68.7	33.4

**Source:** Telephone Survey of District Eisenhower Coordinators, Spring 1998.

**Variables:** DA058-2.3.4 and DA061-2.3.4

## EXHIBIT G.5.11a

### Relationship of District Management to Design and Characteristics of Professional Development

Control variables	Dependent Variables <sup>a</sup>									
	Align	Coordinate	District Planning	Continuous Improvement	Teacher Planning	Reform	Time Span	Collective Participation	Active Learning	Targeting
Cluster	.02	-.03	-.21***	.15**	.08	-.08	-.01	.02	-0.1	0.02
	.04	-.14	-.35	.20	.06	-.03	-.01	.01	-0.05	0.02
	(.12)	(.22)	(.10)	(.07)	(.04)	(.03)	(.06)	(.05)	(.03)	(.06)
Consortium	.45	.33	.59	-.08	.15	.41	.54	-.37	0.53	0.21
	1.45	2.22	1.63	-.17	.18	.28	.82	-.44	0.37	0.36
	(1.23)	(2.31)	(1.03)	(.73)	(.46)	(.26)	(.54)	(.47)	(.25)	(.60)
Size	.15	.30***	.07	.22***	-.05	.06	.07	.09	.27***	.00
	.10	.40	.04	.09	-.01	.01	.02	.02	.04	.00
	(.04)	(.07)	(.03)	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.02)
Size by Consortium	-.51	-.34	-.53	.19	-.09	-.46	-.57	.40	-.60	-.29
	-.22	-.30	-.20	.05	-.01	-.04	-.11	.06	-.06	-.07
	(.17)	(.31)	(.14)	(.10)	(.06)	(.04)	(.07)	(.06)	(.03)	(.08)
Poverty	.05	.30***	.08	.06	-.03	-.04	-.02	-.02	.07	.23***
	.00	.06	.01	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01
	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)

**Note:** <sup>a</sup> For each dependent variable, standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) is shown on the first line; unstandardized regression coefficient (b) on the second line; standard error (in parentheses) on the third line.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

EXHIBIT G.5.11a (Continued)

Relationship of District Implementation to Design Characteristics  
of Professional Development

Predictors	Dependent Variables <sup>a</sup>							
	District Planning	Continuous Improvement	Teacher Planning	Reform	Time Span	Collective Participation	Active Learning	Targeting
Alignment	-.08 -.03 (.02)	.16** .03 (.02)	.16** .03 (.01)	.15* .01 (.01)	-.01 .00 (.01)	.14* .03 (.01)	.04 .00 (.01)	.17** .04 (.01)
Coordination	.07 .06 (.04)	.16*** .11 (.03)	.02 .01 (.02)	.12* .03 (.01)	.03 .01 (.02)	.05 .02 (.02)	.07 .02 (.01)	.05 .03 (.03)
District vs. School Level Planning				-.07 -.02 (.01)	.11* .06 (.03)	-.09 .04 (.02)	-.09 .02 (.01)	.08 .05 (.03)
Continuous Improvement				.06 .02 (.02)	.08 .06 (.04)	.13 .02 (.04)	.20*** .07 (.02)	.17** .14 (.04)
Teacher Participation in Planning				-.07 -.04 (.03)	.03 .04 (.06)	.08 .08 (.06)	.20*** .12 (.03)	.16*** .24 (.07)
Reform vs. Traditional					.40*** .88 (.11)			
R <sup>2</sup> (in percentage)	6.6	23.0	2.9	6.2	20.6	9.5	23.1	23.0

**Note:** <sup>a</sup> For each dependent variable, standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) is shown on the first line; unstandardized regression coefficient (b) on the second line; standard error (in parentheses) on the third line.  
\* $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11b

### Variable Definitions

Variables	Symbol	Coding
Cluster	CLUSTER	Based on DA056 District without clusters=0, with clusters=1
Consortium	CONSORT (source: survey database)	Regular district=0, consortium=1
Size	LOGTCH (source: CCD)	Base 10 log of number of teachers in district
Size by Consortium	CONLOG	Interaction of Size and Consortium Status (CONSORT*SIZE)
Poverty	POVERTY (source: CCD)	Percent of school-age children in poverty (0-100)
Alignment	PDIRT	IRT scale score, based on 8 items, DA155, DA157, DA160, DA162, DA166, DA168, DA171, DA173. Each variable indicates the extent to which professional development is designed to help teachers adapt their teacher to state and district standards and assessments in mathematics and science. Each item is coded 0 (not at all), 1 (to some extent), and 2 (to a great extent). Each Eisenhower coordinator responded to only those items that applied in the coordinator's district and state. For example, coordinators were asked about alignment with state assessments in science only for districts in states with such assessments. We estimated an IRT "partial credit model," allowing separate slopes and intercepts for each item. The estimated IRT scale score has a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of one. It was rescaled for Exhibit 5.1 to have a range from 1 to 5.
Coordination/Co-funding	NPROGF	Number of programs with which district co-funds, sum of DA007, DA011, DA015, DA019, DA023, DA027, DA031, DA035, DA039, DA043, DA047, DA051, DA055, and DA059, each coded Yes=1 and No=0.

## EXHIBIT G.5.11b (Continued)

### Variable Definitions

Variables	Symbol	Coding
District vs. School-level planning	DLEVPLAN	DA050, coded 0= none through 3=all activities planned at district level
Continuous improvement	CONIMP_D	<p>Sum of five scales: NEEDSA, DSUPPRO, DSUPSCH, INDICD, EVAL_D, defined as follows:</p> <p>NEEDSA = sum of DB079_1 - DB079_5  DSUPPRO = sum of DB143_1–DB143_4, DB145_1–DB145_5  DSUPSCH= sum of DB147_1-DB147_4, DB149_1-DB149_5  INDICD=  EVAL-D= sum of DB084_1—DB084-4</p> <p>The reliability of the composite is 0.61.</p>
Teacher participation in planning	TCHPART	Weighted sum of teacher participation at district, cluster, and school levels, in proportion to the number of activities planned at each level: DA050*DA051_1 + DA057*Da058_3 + DA060*DA061_3
Reform vs Traditional	PCTNEW2	<p>Percent of participations in reform types of activities</p> <p>PCTNEW2 = PCTNET+PCTINT+PCTMNT+PCTRCT+PCTCOM+PCTSTY +PCTRES</p> <p>Where</p> <p>PCTNET = percent of participations in networks  PCTINT = percent of participations in internships  PCTRCT = percent of participations in resource centers  PCTCOM = percent of participations in committees  PCTSTD = percent of participations in study groups  PCTRES = percent of participations in individual research projects</p> <p>The total number of participations in all types of activities is defined as (TOTPART) defined as the sum of DA076, DADA088, DA098, DA102, DA110, DA118, DA124, DA130*DA131, DA138*DA139, DA145. The percent of participations in networks (PCTNET) = DA102/Totpart, etc.</p>

---

The number of types of Eisenhower-assisted activities, NUMTYPER, is the sum of the number of types with one or more participants

---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11b (Continued)

### Variable Definitions

Variables	Symbol	Coding
Time Span	DURATION	<p>Duration of Eisenhower assisted activities, defined as the weighted average of the typical duration of each supported type, in proportion to the number of participations in each type. For each type, the typical duration is coded 1= one month or less, 2=between one month and one year, 3=more than one year. The typical duration of in-district workshops (DURIDW) was derived from DA084, which reports the percent of workshops spread over one day, 2-7 days, 8 days to one month, one month to one year, and more than one year. The typical durations of other types were derived from items such as DA106 for networks (DURNET). We did not include items on the survey concerning the typical durations for college courses and resource centers. To create the DURATION variable, we assumed that the duration of college courses s between one month and one year (DURCRS=2). We made the same assumption about the average duration of participation in resource centers. Since the overall rate of participation in these two types of activities is very low, these assumptions make little difference in the overall results.</p> <p><math display="block">\text{DURATION} = \text{PCTIDW} \cdot \text{DURIDW} + \text{PCTODW} \cdot \text{DURIDOW} + \text{PCTCRS} \cdot \text{DURCRS} + \text{PCTNET} \cdot \text{DURCRS} + \text{PCTINT} \cdot \text{DURINT} + \text{PCTMNT} \cdot \text{DURMNT} + \text{PCTRCT} \cdot \text{DURRCT} + \text{PCTCOM} \cdot \text{DURCOM} + \text{PCTSTD} \cdot \text{DURSTD} + \text{PCTRES} \cdot \text{DURRES}</math></p>
Collective Participation	SCHLPART	Sum of DA078_3 and DA078_4, each coded Yes=1, No=0. Defined only for districts with non-zero participations in-district workshops
Active Learning	STCHIDW	Sum of DA081_1 – DA081_5. Defined only for districts with non-zero participations in in-district workshops.
Targeting	TARGET	Average of DB068, DB069, DB070, DB071, and DB072, each coded 1=no emphasis, 1=some emphasis, 2=strong emphasis.

## EXHIBIT G.5.11c

### Correlations among District Professional Development Variables

	Poverty	Consortium	Size	Size by Consortium	Cluster	Alignment	Coordinate	District Planning	Continuous Improvement
Poverty	1.00								
Consortium	.06	1.00							
Size	.37***	.09*	1.00						
Size by Consortium	.09*	.99***	.12**	1.00					
Cluster	.15***	-.29***	.42***	-.29***	1.00				
Alignment	.16***	-.05	.17***	-.06	.11*	1.00			
Coordination	.44***	.04	.42***	.05	.17***	.17***	1.00		
District vs. School Level Planning	.08*	.10**	.05	.10**	-.14***	.08*	-.04	1.00	
Continuous Improvement	.20***	.08*	.30***	.02*	.22***	.23***	.24***	-.10**	1.00
Teacher Participation in Planning	.06	.01	.07	.01	.05	.05	.10**	.00	.03
Reform (vs. Traditional) Type	.14***	-.03	.24***	-.04	.10**	.20***	.23***	-.08*	.14***
Time Span	.07	.06	.16***	.04	.07*	.11**	.04	.14***	.15***
Collective Participation	-.03	.02	.02	.03	.01	.10**	.17***	-.14***	.06
Active Learning	.14***	.07	.30***	.07	.09*	.15***	.18***	-.12**	.28***
Targeting	.40***	-.05	.29***	-.04	.19***	.17***	.35***	.05	.20***

*Note:* \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$



## EXHIBIT G.5.11c (Continued)

### Correlations among District Professional Development Variables

	Teacher Participate	Reform	Time Span	Collective Participation	Active Learning	Targeting
Poverty						
Consortium						
Size						
Size by Consortium						
Cluster						
Alignment						
Coordination						
District vs. School Level Planning						
Continuous Improvement						
Teacher Participation in Planning	1.00					
Reform (vs. Traditional) Type	-.07*	1.00				
Time Span	-.01	.33***	1.00			
Collective Participation	.06	.09*	-.04	1.00		
Active Learning	.22***	.16***	.06	.21***	1.00	
Targeting	.25***	-.03	.09**	.04	.15***	1.00

**Note:** \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

#### DISTRICT TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

NOTE: The District Telephone Interview was administered as a Computer-Assisted form, and the items as administered appeared on a computer screen. The following printed items parallel the versions that appeared on the CATI screen, but some details have been changed.

#### PART A

##### Organizational structure

5-38. I'd like to ask you first about the structure of your district office and your place in it.

	Does your district have position?	Is it funded wholly or in part by Eisenhower funds?	Do you fill the role?	Does the person in the position work with you in making decisions about the Eisenhower program?
Eisenhower coordinator	Y N	Y N	Y N	
Curriculum/instruction coordinator	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N
Mathematics coordinator	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N
Science coordinator	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N
Professional development coordinator	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N
Special education coordinator	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N
Title I coordinator	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N
Federal programs coordinator	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N
Are there other district office staff who work with you in making decisions about Eisenhower? (specify)	Y N	Y N		

##### Professional development

44. In which of the following subject areas do you support professional development using Eisenhower funds? (check all that apply)

- a. Mathematics?
- b. Science?
- c. Any Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

50. How many of your district's Eisenhower-supported activities are planned at the DISTRICT LEVEL?

- 0 None
- 1 Some
- 2 Most
- 3 All

---

---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

51. Which of the following best describes the role teachers play in making decisions about Eisenhower-supported activities planned at the district level?
- Do teachers participate in a formal planning committee
  - Are teachers consulted informally
  - Are teachers consulted in a needs assessment or
  - Do teachers not play a regular role
  - Other (specify)
56. Does your district have sub-districts, clusters, or groups of schools that jointly plan and administer professional development?
- Yes
  - No (skip to 60)
57. How many of your district's Eisenhower-supported activities are planned at the CLUSTER LEVEL?
- None
  - Some
  - Most
  - All
58. Which of the following people participate in making decisions about Eisenhower-supported activities planned at the cluster level?
- Do principals?
  - Do lead teachers, resource teachers, or department chairs?
  - Do classroom teachers, through a formally organized committee?
  - Do teachers as individuals?
  - Do others (specify)?
60. How many of your district's Eisenhower-supported activities are planned at the SCHOOL LEVEL?
- None
  - Some
  - Most
  - All
61. Which of the following people participate in making decisions about Eisenhower-supported activities planned at the school level?
- Do principals?
  - Do lead teachers, resource teachers, or department chairs?
  - Do classroom teachers, through a formally organized committee?
  - Do teachers as individuals?
  - Do others (specify)?
63. Of the teachers in Eisenhower activities, what percent come to participate in each of the following ways?
- What percent volunteer?
  - What percent are selected by their principal or other administrator?

- 
- c. What percent are selected by providers?
  - d. What percent participate by rotation?
  - e. What percent come to participate in other ways?

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

#### In-district workshops or institutes

71. Did your district support in-district workshops or institutes from July 1 through December 1977?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 85)

72. Were any of your workshops or institutes supported, at least in part, with Eisenhower funds?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 85)

76. How many participants attended, counting participants more than once if they attended multiple workshops/institutes?

78. For which of the following groups were workshops specifically designed? (circle all that apply)

Were they designed....

- a. for teachers as individuals
- b. for teachers as representatives of their departments, grade level, or school
- c. for all teachers in department or grade-level groupings
- d. for all teachers in a school or set of schools
- e. in other configurations? (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

81. Which of the following strategies to help teachers implement new skills, if any, were used regularly in conjunction with Eisenhower workshops or institutes? (circle all that apply)

- a. Did teachers observe leaders demonstrating or modeling skills
- b. Did teachers observe other teachers teaching
- c. Did teachers practice under simulated conditions, with feedback
- d. Did teachers meet in groups and discuss problems in implementation
- e. Were teachers observed teaching a regular class?
- f. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- g. No strategies were used

83. Including follow-up events, approximately what percent of your Eisenhower-supported workshops or institutes lasted:

- a. Less than 4 hours \_\_\_\_\_%
- b. Between 4 - 8 hours \_\_\_\_\_%
- c. Between 9 - 40 hours \_\_\_\_\_%
- d. More than 40 hours \_\_\_\_\_%

84. Including follow-up activities, approximately what percent of these workshops or institutes were:

- a. Spread over one day \_\_\_\_\_%

- 
- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| b. Spread over two to seven days               | _____% |
| c. Spread over eight days to one month         | _____% |
| d. Spread over more than one month to one year | _____% |
| e. Spread over more than a year                | _____% |

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

#### Out-of-district workshops or institutes

85. Did your district support out-of-district workshops or institutes from July 1 through December 1977?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 95)

86. Did you use Eisenhower funds to support teachers in attending out-of-district workshops or conferences?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 95)

88. How many teachers did Eisenhower funds support to attend out-of-district workshops or conferences from July 1 through December 1977?

#### College courses

95. Did your district support attendance at college courses from July 1 through December 1977?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 99)

96. Did you use Eisenhower funds to support teachers in taking college courses?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 99)

98. How many teachers did you support for college courses with Eisenhower funds from July 1 through December 1977?

#### Teacher collaboratives or networks

99. Did your district support participation in teacher collaboratives or networks from July 1 through December 1977?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 107)

100. Were any teacher collaboratives or networks supported, at least in part, with Eisenhower funds?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 107)

102. How many teachers did Eisenhower funds support to participate in such collaboratives or networks from July 1 through December 1977?

106. Over what time period did the typical teacher participate in these networks?

- 
- a. One month or less
  - b. More than one month but less than six months
  - c. Between six months and one year, or
  - d. More than one year

**Internship or immersion activities**

107. Did your district support internship or immersion activities from July 1 through December 1977?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 114)

**EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)**

**Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5**

108. Were any internship or immersion activities supported, at least in part, with Eisenhower funds?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 114)
110. How many teachers did Eisenhower funds support to participate in immersion activities from July 1 through December 1997?
111. How long did the typical immersion activity last?
- a. One day or less
  - b. More than one day but less than one week
  - c. Between one week and one month, or
  - d. Longer than one month

**Mentoring, coaching, or observation**

114. Did your district support mentoring, coaching, or observation activities from July 1 through December 1977?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 122)
115. Were any mentoring/coaching/observing activities supported, at least in part, with Eisenhower funds?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 122)
118. How many teachers were mentored, coached, or observed from July 1 through December 1997 using Eisenhower funds?
121. How long did the typical mentor- or coach-teacher relationship last?
- a. One day or less
  - b. More than one day but less than one week
  - c. More than one week but less than one month
  - d. Between one month and one year, or
  - d. More than one year

---

**Teacher resource center**

122. Did your district support a teacher resource center from July 1 through December 1977?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 127)

123. Did you use Eisenhower funds to support the teacher resource center?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 127)

124. About how many teachers used the teacher resource center from July 1 through December 1977?



---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

#### Teacher committees or task forces

127. Did your district support teacher committees or task forces to improve teaching and learning from July 1 through December 1977?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 135)
128. Were any teacher committees or task forces supported, at least in part, with Eisenhower funds?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 135)
130. How many such groups did Eisenhower funds support from July 1 through December 1977?
131. About how many teachers participated in the typical committee or task force?
134. Over what period of time did the typical task force or committee meet?
- a. One day or less
  - b. More than one day but less than one week
  - c. More than one week but less than one month
  - d. Between one month and one year, or
  - d. More than one year

#### Teacher study groups

135. Did your district support teacher study groups from July 1 through December 1977?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 142)
136. Were any teacher study groups supported, at least in part, with Eisenhower funds?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 142)
138. How many such groups did Eisenhower funds support from July 1 through December 1977?
139. About how many teachers participated in the typical study group?
141. Over what period of time did the typical study group meet?
- a. One day or less
  - b. More than one day but less than one week
  - c. More than one week but less than one month
  - d. Between one month and one year, or
  - d. More than one year

---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

#### Individual research projects

142. Did your district support individual research projects from July 1 through December 1977?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 147)
143. Were any individual research projects supported, at least in part, with Eisenhower funds?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 142)
145. How many such projects did Eisenhower funds support from July 1 through December 1977?
146. How long did the typical research project last?
- a. One week or less
  - b. More than one week to a month
  - c. More than a month to a year
  - d. More than a year

#### Other professional development

147. Did your district support any other professional development from July 1 through December 1977?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 150)
148. Did you use Eisenhower funds to support any of these activities?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 142)

#### Systemic reform efforts and the Eisenhower Program

154. Have STATE-WIDE standards or curriculum frameworks in MATHEMATICS been adopted?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 156)
155. To what extent are Eisenhower-supported activities in your district designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to meet STATE-WIDE standards or frameworks in MATHEMATICS?
- a. The activities are not at all designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to these statewide mathematics standards and frameworks
  - b. The activities are designed to some extent to do this, or
  - c. The activities are designed to a large extent to do this
156. Have DISTRICT-WIDE standards or curriculum frameworks in MATHEMATICS been adopted?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 159)

---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

157. To what extent are Eisenhower-supported activities in your district designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to meet DISTRICT-WIDE standards or frameworks in MATHEMATICS?
- a. The activities are not at all designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to these district-wide mathematics standards and frameworks
  - b. The activities are designed to some extent to do this, or
  - c. The activities are designed to a large extent to do this
154. Have STATE-WIDE standards or curriculum frameworks in SCIENCE been adopted?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 156)
155. To what extent are Eisenhower-supported activities in your district designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to meet STATE-WIDE standards or frameworks in SCIENCE?
- a. The activities are not at all designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to these statewide science standards and frameworks
  - b. The activities are designed to some extent to do this, or
  - c. The activities are designed to a large extent to do this
156. Have DISTRICT-WIDE standards or curriculum frameworks in SCIENCE been adopted?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 159)
157. To what extent are Eisenhower-supported activities in your district designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to meet DISTRICT-WIDE standards or frameworks in SCIENCE?
- a. The activities are not at all designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to these district-wide science standards and frameworks
  - b. The activities are designed to some extent to do this, or
  - c. The activities are designed to a large extent to do this
165. Are STATE-WIDE assessments in MATHEMATICS administered in your district?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 167)
166. To what extent are Eisenhower-supported activities in your district designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to meet STATE-WIDE assessment requirements in MATHEMATICS?
- a. The activities are not at all designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to these statewide mathematics assessment requirements
  - b. The activities are designed to some extent to do this, or
  - c. The activities are designed to a large extent to do this
167. Does your district administer DISTRICT-WIDE assessments in MATHEMATICS?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 170)

---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

168. To what extent are Eisenhower-supported activities in your district designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to meet DISTRICT-WIDE assessment requirements in MATHEMATICS?
- a. The activities are not at all designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to these district-wide mathematics assessment requirements
  - b. The activities are designed to some extent to do this, or
  - c. The activities are designed to a large extent to do this
170. Are STATE-WIDE assessments in SCIENCE administered in your district?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 172)
166. To what extent are Eisenhower-supported activities in your district designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to meet STATE-WIDE assessment requirements in SCIENCE?
- a. The activities are not at all designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to these statewide science assessment requirements
  - b. The activities are designed to some extent to do this, or
  - c. The activities are designed to a large extent to do this
167. Does your district administer DISTRICT-WIDE assessments in SCIENCE?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 170)
168. To what extent are Eisenhower-supported activities in your district designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to meet DISTRICT-WIDE assessment requirements in SCIENCE?
- a. The activities are not at all designed to help teachers adapt their teaching to these district-wide science assessment requirements
  - b. The activities are designed to some extent to do this, or
  - c. The activities are designed to a large extent to do this

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

#### PART B

Now I'd like to ask about various Federal programs that may operate in your state or district, and the relationship between these programs and the Eisenhower program.

5-61. Please answer the following questions about these Federal programs. (Items number from 5 to 61, beginning with first row)  
[Interviewer: Ask each question about SSI, then about USI, etc.]

	Did [PROGRAM] operate in your state or district last year?	Did it support professional development in your district last year?	Did the program co-fund professional development with Eisenhower in the last year?	Did program staff work closely with Eisenhower staff in the last year?
National Science Foundation: Statewide Systemic Initiative	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
National Science Foundation: Urban Systemic Initiative	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
National Science Foundation: Rural Systemic Initiative	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
National Science Foundation: Local Systemic Change	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Title I: Part A (Helping Disadvantaged Children)	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Title I: Part C (Education of Migrant Children)	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Title III: Technology for Education	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Title IV: Innovative Education Program Strategies	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Title VII: Bilingual Education	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Title IX: Indian Education	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Goals 2000	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
School to work programs	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Perkins Vocational Education Funds	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N
Other (please explain)	Y N Don't know	Y N	Y N	Y N

---

---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

#### Targeting and recruitment

65-74: How much emphasis do you give to recruiting:

	No Particular <u>Emphasis</u>	Some <u>Emphasis</u>	Strong <u>Emphasis</u>
a. Teachers from Title I schools.....	0	1	2
b. Title I teachers.....	0	1	2
c. Special education teachers.....	0	1	2
d. Teachers of limited English proficiency students .....	0	1	2
e. Teachers from schools with low achievement levels .....	0	1	2
f. Teachers from high poverty schools (50% or more students eligible for free/reduced price lunch) .....	0	1	2
g. Paraprofessionals.....	0	1	2
h. Other (specify) .....	0	1	2

75. In which of the following ways do you try to increase the participation of teachers, paraprofessionals, or other populations? (circle all that apply)

Do you....

- a. Publicize activities
- b. Tailor the focus of professional development towards the needs of special population
- c. Use incentives
- d. Do you use other strategies?
- e. No special strategies are used

#### Processes and procedures

78. Are teachers' needs for professional development formally assessed?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 82)

79. In which of the following ways are teachers' needs for professional development assessed? (circle all that apply)

- a. With a survey of teachers
- b. With meetings of teacher representatives
- c. With a survey of principals or department chairs
- d. With measures of student performance
- e. With informal conversations

- 
- f. Are teachers' needs assessed in other ways (please specify)

### EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

## Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

83. Do you evaluate Eisenhower-supported professional development?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 85)

84. In which of the following ways do you evaluate Eisenhower-supported professional development? (circle all that apply)

With or by....

- a. By number of teachers participating in professional development
- b. With a teacher satisfaction survey
- c. With observations of teachers
- d. With student achievement scores
- e. In other ways (please specify)

88. Has your DISTRICT developed performance indicators for professional development?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 90)

89. Is your DISTRICT currently developing performance indicators for professional development?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 96)

142. Do district Eisenhower staff EXCHANGE INFORMATION with SCHOOLS regarding professional development?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 144)

143. In which of the following ways do district Eisenhower staff exchange information with schools regarding professional development? (circle all that apply)

Through....

- a. Regular visits and observations
- b. Telephone calls to schools
- c. Regular required reports from schools
- d. Required evaluations of school-level professional development programs
- e. In other ways (please specify)



- 
144. Do district Eisenhower staff provide assistance to schools?
- 1 Yes
  - 2 No (skip to 146)

---

## EXHIBIT G.5.11d (Continued)

### Items from District Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapters 4 and 5

145. Which of the following kinds of assistance do they provide? (all that apply)

Do they....

- a. Provide guidance in interpreting Title II rules and regulations
- b. Help conducting needs assessments
- c. Help developing professional development plan
- d. Help developing specific activities
- e. Help developing performance indicators for professional development
- f. Assist in other ways (please specify)

146. Do district Eisenhower staff EXCHANGE INFORMATION with professional development providers?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 148)

147. In which of the following ways do they exchange information?

Through....

- a. Regular visits and observations of professional development activities
- b. Telephone calls to professional development providers
- c. Regular required reports from providers
- d. Required evaluations of professional development activities
- e. Other ways (please specify)

148. Do district Eisenhower staff provide assistance to professional development providers?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 150)

149. Which of the following kinds of assistance do district Eisenhower staff provide to professional development providers?

Do they

- a. Provide guidance in interpreting Title II rules and regulations
- b. Help conducting needs assessments
- c. Help developing professional development plans
- d. Help developing specific activities
- e. Help developing performance indicators for professional development
- f. Assist in other ways (please specify)